## REMARKS

### New Claims

Applicant has added claims 30-34 and would appreciate it if the Examiner would consider these for allowance.

### Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-7, 9-11, 19-25, and 27-29 under 35 U.S.C §103(a), as being obvious over Bates et al. (US Pat 7,080,402) ("Bates") in view of Hayduk (US Pub 2003/0054833) ("Hayduk"). For the reasons set forth below, Applicant asserts that the cited references fail to teach, suggest, or render obvious Applicant's invention as claimed in claims 1-7, 9-11, 19-25, and 27-29.

Bates discloses applications/functions within an electronic processing device having a **GPS** card and antenna, such as a laptop or personal digital assistant, can be enabled only when in a specified geographic location. (Bates abstract) (Emphasis added) Bates further discloses "the geographic location of the electronic processing device is determined, preferably by using the **GPS** signals received using **GPS** processing electronics installed in the device." (Bates, column 7, lines 13-16) (Emphasis added)

Hayduk discloses a system that includes a mobile element having user service preferences whose position is monitored by a position monitoring module. (Hayduk abstract)

Furthermore, the Examiner has stated that he disagrees with the Applicant's argument because although GPS is a one way communication form (i.e. satellite to

ground device), there are other satellite communication systems that have two way communication, such as satellite phones. Applicant disagrees that this combination of technologies the Examiner has alluded to would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art regarding combining 2-way communications with Bates GPS system. Applicant will address this argument below.

With respect to newly amended independent claim 1 in the presently claimed invention, Applicant teaches and claims:

"A method, comprising:

establishing a connection between a wireless electronic device and one or more supervisory devices associated with an area of wireless coverage;

*the wireless electronic device sending configuration information associated with the wireless electronic device to at least one of the one or more supervisory devices*;

at least one of the one or more supervisory devices sending information associated with the area of wireless coverage to the wireless electronic device; and

*at least one of the supervisory devices determining which functions are available for use on the wireless device in the area of wireless coverage using the device configuration information and the information associated with the area of wireless coverage*, and based on the determination, sending permission information for the operation of each

function of the wireless electronic device within the area of wireless coverage." (Claim 1) (Emphasis added)

Applicant asserts that Bates and Hayduk do not teach, suggest, or render obvious Applicant's invention as claimed in independent claim 1 because Bates does not teach 2-way satellite to ground communications and there would be no inherent reason to combine Bates' GPS system with a 2-way satellite communication system. There are multiple reasons why this combination would not be obvious.

The system in Bates involves all relevant logic to determine configuration of the wireless device within the device. Applicant's newly amended claim 1 (at the emphasized portions above) includes this logic specifically in the supervisory device (which the Examiner is referring to as the satellite). While there are many types of communication satellites, the specific satellite system involved in Bates is limited to GPS. To include this form of logic in the GPS satellite (i.e. logic that determines and sends permissions to wireless devices) would be burdensome and any GPS-type satellite would be ill-equipped. While many satellite communication systems involve complex two-way communications, GPS satellites are inherently simple because they just have to broadcast a ping signal, which ground-based devices pick up and interpret through triangulation. All complex logic in GPS systems to determine location is in the ground devices.

Applicant does not see where a simple GPS satellite one-way ping broadcast system would be obvious to combine with complex 2-way satellite communication systems. There is no logic in the GPS satellites to receive communications and to add that functionality into a satellite would be unnecessarily burdensome and not useful for

the purpose of GPS. Therefore, these two disparate satellite technologies cannot be obviously combined. Thus, Applicant submits that it would not be obvious to combine the GPS-based location technology portion of Bates with any 2-way satellite communication technology. Additionally, Applicant respectfully submits that Bates and Hayduk, each taken alone or in combination, do not render independent claim 1 obvious.

Independent claim 19 includes limitations similar to claim 1. Thus, for at least the same reasons as advanced above with respect to claim 1, Applicant submits that Bates and Hayduk, each taken alone or in combination, do not render independent claim 19 obvious.

Claims 2-5 and 20-23 depend from and further limit independent claims 1 and 19, respectively. Thus, for at least the same reasons as advanced above with respect to independent claims 1 and 19, Applicant submits that Bates and Hayduk, each taken alone or in combination, do not render claims 2-5 and 20-23 obvious.

Furthermore, Applicant has cancelled claims 6-18 and 24-29, thus any rejections based on these claims are moot.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests removal of the 35 U.S.C §103(a) rejection of claims 1-7, 9-11, 19-25, and 27-29.

The Examiner has rejected claims 8 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bates in view of Hayduk and further in view of Daniels et al. (US App 2004/0259574) ("Daniels"). These claims have been cancelled, thus, this rejection is moot. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests removal of the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claims 8 and 26.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant respectfully submits that all rejections have been overcome and that all pending claims are in condition for allowance.

If there are any additional charges, please charge them to our Deposit Account Number 50-0221. If a telephone conference would facilitate the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Derek J. Reynolds at (916) 356-5374.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: November 24, 2008 /Derek J. Reynolds/
Derek J. Reynolds
Reg. No.: 60,104

Intel Corporation
c/o Intellevate, LLC
P.O. Box 52050
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(916)356-5358